

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/966,592	<b>Applicant(s)</b> NAKABO, AKINOBU	
	<b>Examiner</b> Steven S. Paik	<b>Art Unit</b> 2876	

**All Participants:**

(1) Steven S. Paik.

(2) Taylor Jordan (Reg. No. 55,309).

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 5 February 2004

**Time:** 09:30am

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 12, and 21

Prior art documents discussed:


**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*Re claims 1, 12, and 21, the examiner pointed out a few phrases that lack a proper antecedent basis. The applicant's representative has agreed and authorized for the Examiner's Amendment to correct the issue.*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
**MICHAEL G. LEE**  
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)